

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations  
and is not a part of the Official Record

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,  
please do not report the images to the  
Image Problem Mailbox.



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/003,072	12/06/2001	Bart Alfons Peter Van Doorselaer	Q67388	4879
7590	07/01/2004		EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20037-3213			ARSHAD, UMAR	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/003,072	VAN DOORSELAER ET AL.
	Examiner Umar Arshad	Art Unit 2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 December 2001.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/6/2001</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 1 – 12 are objected to because of the following informalities: the word “characterized” is spelled incorrectly. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Borman et al. (“Borman”) U.S. Patent No. 6,226,655.

As per claim 1, Borman teaches a web browsing device, for selecting a specific hyperlink from a set of hyperlinks included in a hyper-document, each hyperlink of said set referring to a web

resource, characterized in that said web browsing device comprises the following parts:

- a. association holding part (AHP), adapted to hold for said specific hyperlink an association of said specific hyperlink with a corresponding description (see Borman, column 8, lines 9 – 17) and a user direct select action (see Borman, column 7, lines 5 – 11) ;
- b. association presenting part (APP), coupled with an input to an output of said association holding part (AHP) and adapted to present for each said specific hyperlink, said corresponding description and said user direct select action (see Borman, figure 3, items 312 – 320, figure 5C, items 508 – 514, column 7, lines 5 – 11 and column 8, lines 22 – 42);
- c. user direct select action detecting part (USADP), adapted to detect the activation of said user direct select action (see Borman, column 9, lines 1 – 8); and
- d. hyperlink determination part (HLDP), coupled with an input to an output of said user direct select action detecting part (USADP) and adapted to determine said specific hyperlink from said association holding part (AHP) based on the detection of said activation of said user direct select action (see Borman, column 9, lines 1 – 8).

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Borman teaches the device of claim 1 (see rejection above). Borman further teaches the web browsing device according to claim 1, characterized in that said browsing device further comprises an association holding updating part (AHUP), coupled with an output to an input of said association holding part (AHP) and adapted to update said association by assigning another specific hyperlink and corresponding description to said user select action (see Borman, column 7, lines 5 – 11 and column 11, lines 62 – 66; it is inherent that the hot link associated with the “next entry” and “previous entry” buttons will be updated when the user moves to a new hot link in the list of hot links).

As per claims 5 and 6, they are of similar scope to claims 1 and 2 respectively, and are rejected under the same rationale.

As per claims 9 and 10, they are of similar scope to claims 1 and 2 respectively, and are rejected under the same rationale.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 7 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Borman et al. ("Borman") U.S. Patent No. 6,226,655 in view of Grant, U.S. Patent No. 5,854,624.

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Borman teaches the device of claim 1 (see rejection above). Borman does not teach a web browsing device according to claim 1, characterized in that said user direct select action is a predefined keystroke. Grant teaches wherein user direct select action is a predefined keystroke (see Grant, column 3, lines 7 – 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Grant with the method of Borman in order to provide a quicker means of executing frequently used

functions.

As per claims 7 and 11, they are of similar scope to claim 3 and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 4, 8 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Borman et al. ("Borman") U.S. Patent No. 6,226,655 in view of Scott et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,101,473.

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Borman teaches the device of claim 1 (see rejection above). Borman does not teach a web browsing device according to claim 1, characterized in that said user direct select action is a predefined spoken word or phrase. Scott teaches wherein user direct select action is a predefined spoken word or phrase (see Scott, column 3, lines 6 – 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Scott with the method of Borman in order to provide a quicker means of executing frequently used functions.

As per claims 8 and 12, they are of similar scope to claim 3 and are rejected under the same rationale.

### ***Conclusion***

Art Unit: 2174

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Umar Arshad whose telephone number is (703) 305-0329. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L Kincaid can be reached on (703) 308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*Kristine Kincaid*  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPPLYING PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

UA